

REMARKS

Applicant cancelled Claims 24-34 and added Claims 35-43. No new matter is added by these amendments.

The Rejections:

The Examiner rejected Claims 24-27, 30, and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0043771 of Mizutani et al. in view of the U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0014102 of Mattingly et al.

With respect to independent Claims 24 and 32, the Examiner stated that Mizutani et al. discloses all the limitations except the peripheral device not having any USB communication capability. However, the Examiner noted that Mattingly et al. discloses that the hub 102 is providing wireless communications to a plurality of users, through devices 104a-n that can include any integral device that is configured for accessing a computer system wirelessly and does not include USB capability. According to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Mattingly et al.'s teaching into Mizutani et al.'s system so as to implement wireless peripherals without use of USB capability since Mattingly et al. shows such devices to be equivalent and Mizutani et al. suggests that any device may be used.

The Examiner rejected Claims 28-29 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani et al. in view of Mattingly et al.

With respect to Claim 31, the Examiner stated that Mizutani et al. discloses all the limitations except the 2nd remote wireless peripheral devices and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to have the 2nd remote peripheral device since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

Applicant's Arguments:

The Mizutani et al. publication shows a wireless device and a method for state change wireless transmission. A computer (1) has a USB connector (11) connected to a USB interface unit A (15) of a wireless hub (3). The wireless hub (3) communicates via a wireless transceiver

(21) with a wireless transceiver B (23) in a wireless port (5). The wireless port (5) includes a USB interface unit B (27). A USB peripheral device (7) has a USB connector (29) connected to the USB interface unit B (27). Thus, the wireless hub (3) and the wireless port (5) cooperate to make possible wireless communication between the computer (1) and the USB device (7). Clearly the USB device (7) is a conventional unit designed to be connected to the computer (1) in a usual manner utilizing the USB connectors (11, 29) and a USB cable. The wireless port (5) is a separate unit designed to connect to the USB connector of any conventional USB device to enable RF communication. Thus, the USB device (7) has only USB communication capability and the wireless port (5) has both USB and wireless communication capabilities.

As admitted by the Examiner, the Mizutani et al. publication does not show or suggest a peripheral device not having any USB communication capability as defined by Applicant's claims. However, the new ground of rejection incorporates Mattingly et al. which, according to the Examiner, "evidences the equivalence of integral wireless communication peripherals."

Mattingly et al. concerns a computer telephony system that supports a plurality of user access devices and/or is connected to multiple external telephone lines. The devices 104a-n are not computer peripherals, but include personal communication devices such as wireless telephones, pagers, portable computers and PDA's. Thus, the Mattingly et al. devices 104a-n are not the equivalent of and can not be substituted for the Mizutani et al. USB device (7) and wireless port (5) combination.

Applicant's new independent Claim 35 defines the peripheral device as "generating device information causing associated operations to be performed by the computer" and as being one of a keyboard, a mouse and a joystick. Applicant's new independent Claim 37 defines the peripheral device as "generating device information causing associated operations to be performed by the computer". Applicant's new independent Claim 43 defines the at least two peripheral devices as each "generating device information related to operations performed by said device", as including a keyboard and a mouse, and as "controlling the operations of the computer" with the device information.

There is no combination of Mizutani et al. and Mattingly et al. that results in the claimed hub and one or more peripheral devices that communicate solely by RF transmission and wherein the hub can be connected to the USB port of a computer. Applicant has rewritten the cancelled

claims to clarify the differences between the Mizutani et al. system and Applicant's invention and between the Mattingly et al. system and Applicant's invention.

The Examiner cited but did not rely upon U.S. Patent No. 6,778,519 issued to Harrell et al. Applicant reviewed this patent and found it to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in his rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.